

Supplementary table S1. Effect of CCT129202 on reversing ABCB1-mediated MDR in KBv200 cells with different expression of ABCB1

KBv200 cells	IC ₅₀ ±SD (μM; fold-reversal)			
	Doxorubicin	fold-reversal 1	Doxorubicin+0.5μMCCT129202	fold-reversal 2
control	4.326 ± 1.190	(1.00)	1.072 ± 0.041 **	(4.04)
NC-siRNA	4.625 ± 0.536	(0.94)	1.277 ± 0.183 **	(3.39)
ABCB1-siRNA-1	4.476 ± 0.422	(0.97)	1.254 ± 0.329 **	(3.45)
ABCB1-siRNA-2	1.345 ± 0.162 **	(3.22)	0.740 ± 0.076 **	(5.84)
ABCB1-siRNA-3	1.191 ± 0.122 **	(3.63)	0.765 ± 0.071 **	(5.65)

NOTE: “fold-reversal 1”=IC₅₀ of control/ IC₅₀ of cells treated with doxorubicin alone; “fold-reversal 2”= IC₅₀ of control /IC₅₀ of cells treated with doxorubicin +0.5μMCCT129202. Cell survival was performed by MTT assay as described in Materials and Methods. Data are shown as the mean ± standard deviation (SD) of at least three independent experiments performed in triplicate. **, $p < 0.01$ for values versus that obtained in the absence of CCT129202 in KBv200 cells. *This material is available free of charge via the Internet at <http://pubs.acs.org>*

Supplementary table S2 The clinical characteristics of 20 patients with esophageal carcinomas in TECIA study

NO.	Sex	Age (years)	Tumor location	Histological grading	TNM classification	Expression of ABCB1	Inhibit Rate (%)		
							Paclitaxel	CCT129202	CCT129202+Paclitaxel
1	Male	55	Middle	PD	T3N0M0	Negative	79.5 ± 17.5	-7.0 ± 10.8	82.2 ± 12.7
2	Female	62	Middle	PD	T3N0M0	Positive (++)	23.0 ± 9.8	3.0 ± 5.7	59.9 ± 12.6
3	Male	69	Middle	PD	T3N2M0	Negative	53.8 ± 14.2	5.3 ± 2.5	50.1 ± 4.3
4	Male	69	Middle	MD	T2N0M0	Negative	48.9 ± 14.6	27.1 ± 11.2	46.3 ± 22.3
5	Male	54	Lower	MD	T3N0M0	Negative	57.7 ± 13.8	-5.0 ± 5.42	49.9 ± 18.4
6	Male	74	Lower	MD	T3N0M0	Negative	44.8 ± 1.7	2.3 ± 7.9	32.8 ± 22.7
7	Male	55	Lower	MD	T3N2M0	Negative	77.6 ± 20.6	8.3 ± 9.2	90.9 ± 30.3
8	Female	68	Middle	MD	T3N1M0	Negative	3.4 ± 3.2	3.76 ± 8.7	44.3 ± 14.0
9	Male	50	Lower	MD	T3N1M0	Positive (+++)	24.3 ± 24.0	-5.1 ± 8.4	73.5 ± 5.9
10	Female	48	Middle	MD	T3N1M0	Negative	87.4 ± 14.0	37.6 ± 17.6	97.1 ± 4.4
11	Male	67	Lower	MD	T3N0M0	Negative	83.9 ± 16.2	17.9 ± 2.1	72.1 ± 16.7
12	Male	58	Middle	WD	T3N0M0	Negative	46.3 ± 11.8	10.8 ± 3.9	72.4 ± 22.8
13	Male	66	Lower	MD	T2N2M0	Negative	42.4 ± 27.0	30.1 ± 5.2	60.9 ± 26.1
14	Male	67	Middle	WD	T3N0M0	Negative	22.7 ± 3.9	24.3 ± 9.4	45.4 ± 9.9
15	Male	47	Lower	MD	T3N0M0	Negative	39.4 ± 9.2	14.1 ± 11.8	60.8 ± 30.4
16	Male	70	Middle	MD	T3N0M0	Positive (+)	9.70 ± 5.0	4.3 ± 2.0	61.2 ± 29.8
17	Male	44	Middle	WD	T3N0M0	Negative	42.2 ± 10.5	5.3 ± 10.2	54.4 ± 6.2
18	Male	76	Middle	MD	T3N0M0	Negative	75.2 ± 3.3	27.8 ± 4.3	92.0 ± 4.6
19	Female	58	Middle	MD	T3N0M0	Negative	50.8 ± 28.2	-3.1 ± 7.3	83.0 ± 16.7
20	Male	47	Middle	PD	T3N2M0	Negative	91.4 ± 9.05	-6.9 ± 3.8	91.2 ± 14.3

NOTE: Tumor histoculture end-point staining computer-image-analysis (TECIA) was performed as described in Materials and Methods section. Experiments were performed in quadruplicate and inhibition rate was shown as mean ± SD. Positive staining of IHC was graded as follows: (+) low-intensity; (++) moderate-intensity; (+++) high-intensity. PD: poorly differentiated; WD: well differentiated; MD: moderately differentiated. *This material is available free of charge via the Internet at <http://pubs.acs.org>*